

Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring

Module #6: Transmission Simulator Method

M. S. Allen, R. L. Mayes, and E. J. Bergman, "Experimental Modal Substructuring to Couple and Uncouple Substructures with Flexible Fixtures and Multi-point Connections," Journal of Sound and Vibration, vol. 329, pp. 4891–4906, 2010, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsv.2010.06.007>.



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WISCONSIN
MADISON



ETH zürich

Matthew S. Allen

Professor, Engineering Physics Dept, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Randall L. Mayes

Distinguished Member of Technical Staff, Sandia National Labs.

Paolo Tiso

Senior Scientist, Dept. of Mechanical and Process Eng., ETH Zürich

Short Course Notes For:

February 8, 2020, IMAC, Houston, TX, USA

1

Modal Substructuring (CMS)

- As discussed previously, if we have the modal parameters of two systems, either from analysis or experiment, we can write:

$$M^{(s)} R^{(s)} \ddot{\eta}^{(s)} + C^{(s)} R^{(s)} \dot{\eta}^{(s)} + K^{(s)} R^{(s)} \eta^{(s)} = \cancel{f^{(s)}} + g^{(s)} + r^{(s)} \quad \text{not shown}$$

$$\rightarrow M_m \ddot{\eta} + C_m \dot{\eta} + K_m \eta = \cancel{f_m} + g_m$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} I^A & 0 \\ 0 & I^B \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \ddot{q}^A \\ \ddot{q}^B \end{Bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 2\zeta_r \omega_r^A & 0 \\ 0 & 2\zeta_r \omega_r^B \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \dot{q}^A \\ \dot{q}^B \end{Bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \omega_r^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_r^2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} q^A \\ q^B \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (\Phi^A)^T & 0 \\ 0 & (\Phi^B)^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} F^A \\ F^B \end{Bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{Bmatrix} y^A \\ y^B \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi^A & 0 \\ 0 & \Phi^B \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} q^A \\ q^B \end{Bmatrix} \quad \text{Interface forces } g \text{ are called } \{F\} \text{ here.}$$


- Then, constraints in the following form are enforced to couple the substructures (we'll use primal assembly):

$$B_p \begin{Bmatrix} y^A \\ y^B \end{Bmatrix} = 0 \quad B = B_p \begin{bmatrix} \Phi^A & 0 \\ 0 & \Phi^B \end{bmatrix} \quad B \begin{Bmatrix} q^A \\ q^B \end{Bmatrix} = 0$$

2

Substructure Uncoupling

- Our approach to “uncouple” structures works by constraining a (negative) model of one component to the structure that cancels the forces at the interface(s).



Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

3

3

The interfaces forces can be made to cancel if:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbf{I}_e \ddot{\mathbf{q}}_e + \mathbf{I}_{an} \ddot{\mathbf{q}}_{an} + \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 2\zeta_r \omega_{r\backslash} \end{smallmatrix} \right]_e \dot{\mathbf{q}}_e + \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 2\zeta_r \omega_{r\backslash} \end{smallmatrix} \right]_{an} \dot{\mathbf{q}}_{an} + \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \omega_{r\backslash}^2 \end{smallmatrix} \right]_e \mathbf{q}_e + \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \omega_{r\backslash}^2 \end{smallmatrix} \right]_{an} \mathbf{q}_{an} = \\
 & = \Phi_e^T \mathbf{F}_e + \Phi_{an}^T \mathbf{F}_{an}
 \end{aligned}$$

- 1.) The motion of both the experimental and analytical fixtures is the same, $\{\mathbf{q}_{an}(t)\} = \{\mathbf{q}_e(t)\}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & [\mathbf{I}_e + \mathbf{I}_{an}](\ddot{\mathbf{q}}_e = \ddot{\mathbf{q}}_{an}) + \left[\left[\begin{smallmatrix} 2\zeta_r \omega_{r\backslash} \end{smallmatrix} \right]_e + \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 2\zeta_r \omega_{r\backslash} \end{smallmatrix} \right]_{an} \right](\dot{\mathbf{q}}_e) + \left[\left[\begin{smallmatrix} \omega_{r\backslash}^2 \end{smallmatrix} \right]_e + \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \omega_{r\backslash}^2 \end{smallmatrix} \right]_{an} \right] \mathbf{q}_e = \\
 & = \Phi_e^T \mathbf{F}_e + \Phi_{an}^T \mathbf{F}_{an}
 \end{aligned}$$

- 2.) The modal parameters of the analytical and true fixtures are equal and opposite, i.e. $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} \omega_{r\backslash}^2 \end{smallmatrix} \right]_{an} = -\left[\begin{smallmatrix} \omega_{r\backslash}^2 \end{smallmatrix} \right]_e$ and similarly for the mass and damping terms.

Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

4

4

The interfaces forces can be made to cancel if:

$$[\mathbf{I}_e - \mathbf{I}_{an}](\ddot{\mathbf{q}}_e = \ddot{\mathbf{q}}_{an}) + \left[\begin{bmatrix} 2\zeta_r \omega_{r\backslash} \end{bmatrix}_e - \begin{bmatrix} 2\zeta_r \omega_{r\backslash} \end{bmatrix}_{an} \right] (\dot{\mathbf{q}}_e) + \left[\begin{bmatrix} \omega_{r\backslash}^2 \end{bmatrix}_e - \begin{bmatrix} \omega_{r\backslash}^2 \end{bmatrix}_{an} \right] \mathbf{q}_e = \\ = \Phi_e^T \mathbf{F}_e + \Phi_{an}^T \mathbf{F}_{an}$$

- 3.) The mode shapes of both the experimental and analytical models are equal $\Phi_{an} = \Phi_e$.
- 4.) The interface force vector is in the range space of Φ_{an}^T .

$$[\sim 0](\ddot{\mathbf{q}}_e = \ddot{\mathbf{q}}_{an}) + [\sim 0](\dot{\mathbf{q}}_e) + [\sim 0]\mathbf{q}_e = \Phi_{an}^T (\mathbf{F}_e + \mathbf{F}_{an})$$

Connection Methods – CPT and MCFS

- One cannot measure the response at the connection point directly, so it must be estimated from other measurements.
 - CPT Method: Connection point responses for the experimental system are estimated using a modal filter and constrained to the analytical fixture A and beam D:

$$\left\{ \begin{Bmatrix} \mathbf{y}^C \end{Bmatrix}_m \\ \begin{Bmatrix} \mathbf{y}^C \end{Bmatrix}_c \end{Bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_m^A \\ \Phi_c^A \end{bmatrix} \left\{ \mathbf{q}^C \right\} \rightarrow \left\{ \mathbf{y}^C \right\}_c = \Phi_c^A \left[\Phi_m^A \right]^\dagger \left\{ \mathbf{y}^C \right\}_m$$


- Modal Constraint Method: Constrain the modal DOF of the Fixture model to their approximation on C: (aka MCFS or “Modal Constraint for Fixture and Subsystem”)

$$\left\{ \begin{Bmatrix} \mathbf{q}^A \end{Bmatrix} = \Phi_m^A \left\{ \mathbf{y}^A \right\}_m \\ \begin{Bmatrix} \mathbf{q}^C \end{Bmatrix} = \Phi_m^A \left\{ \mathbf{y}^C \right\}_m \end{Bmatrix} \rightarrow \left\{ \mathbf{q}^A \right\} = \left\{ \mathbf{q}^C \right\}$$

Note, these are not the modes of C!

Connection Methods – Rationalization

- CMS can be very sensitive to errors when removing a substructure from a system.
- If the fixture is elastic, then it will probably have more modal DOF (N_A) than there are connection point DOF (N_c).
 - e.g. requiring equal 2D motion at the connection point enforces only (3) constraints.
 - When the number of constraints is $N_c < N_A$, it is unlikely that the modes of both structures will match and the interface forces most likely will not cancel!




Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

7

7


Related Techniques

- Sjøvall & Abrahamsson observed a similar phenomenon using FBS and called it “generalized anti-resonance” (GAR).
- Suggested using internal DOF to eliminate motions that are poorly observable on the interface DOF.
 - W. D’Ambrogio and A. Fregolent, (IMAC XXVII) Orlando, Florida, 2009.
 - Sjøvall, P. and T. Abrahamsson (2008). *MSSP* 22(1): 15-33.



$$H(\omega_{GAR})U$$

These approaches will be covered in detail in the next module!




Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

8

8

Test Case #1: T-Beam




- Objective: Join an experimental model of beam B to an analytical model for beam D at point y_c .
 - Measurements on system C = beam B + fixture A
 - Analytical model (Euler-Bernoulli) for fixture A removed from C
 - Beam B + Beam D (tuned Euler-Bernoulli analytical model) = assembly Beam E

Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

9

9

Experimental Procedure



- Careful tests used to estimate the modal parameters of the C system at a number of points on fixture A.
- Hammer used to excite the largest bandwidth (largest number of modes) possible and to avoid modifying structure with the exciter.


Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

10


10

Cases Considered

- Case 1: **CPT**: Models for A, C and D joined at the connection point.
 - Case 1a: Rigid Fixture Model
 - Case 1b: Elastic Fixture Model



- Case 2: **MCFS**: Models for A and C joined using MCFS method.
 - Elastic Fixture Model




Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

11

11

Case 1a: Rigid A, CPT



“Admit” = FBS with
reconstructed FRFs


- Excellent results obtained in the lateral direction (Bending Modes).
- Both the CMS and FRF based Admittance procedures agree very well with the analytical model.
- The CMS result is slightly contaminated by the axial modes at 2400 and 5200 Hz.

Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

12

12

Case 1a: Rigid A, CPT



- **Admittance and CMS both under-predict the natural frequencies of the axial modes by 10% or more.**

□ **Fixture flexibility is important!**

- Contamination at the bending natural frequencies.


□ Possibly due to small curve fitting errors or cross axis sensitivity.

Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

13

13

Case 1b: Flexible A, CPT



- Both FBS and CMS accurately predict the first axial frequency with the flexible fixture model.

- Both methods more severely under-predict the second axial mode.

- Both predict a spurious zero near 5500 Hz.


- The Lateral FRFs were similar to those shown previously.

Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

14

14

Case 2: Flexible A, MCFS Method




Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

15

15

Explanation:




Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

16

16

Significance:

- Now it is possible to robustly remove one flexible structure from another.
- The fixture modal basis gives a convenient basis for the interface – CAN BE USED TO REMOVE/Couple



Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

17



17

Transmission Simulator Method Enables use of Continuous Interfaces



18

Transmission Simulator Method Enables use of Continuous Interfaces



Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring

19

19

Transmission Simulator Design

- Design the TS so that it can be instrumented to capture all of its relevant dynamic modes so that $[\Phi_m]$ will be well conditioned for inversion.
- Choose the mass of the fixture to bring more modes into the testable bandwidth.
- Design the TS so that it can be modeled accurately. Avoid designs that contain joints, intricate geometry, or other features that are difficult to accurately model analytically.
- The joint between the fixture and the test article should replicate the actual joint in the system of interest as closely as possible, to capture the joint stiffness and damping.
- The fixture's impedance should roughly resemble that of the built-up structure. The fixture might just be a chopped off version of the other substructure which precisely mimics the mass and stiffness near the connection interface.

Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020


20

20

Problem of Negative Mass (& Stiffness)

- The transmission simulator must be removed to obtain the desired experimental model.
- The subtraction process may introduce negative mass and stiffness.
- Models with negative mass and stiffness are not readily imported into FEA packages, and they may introduce errors or counter-intuitive results.
- Example: Beam problem mentioned earlier

	Complex f_n (Hz)	$\text{eig}(M) < 0$
Case 1a Rigid Fixture, Con. Pt.	$0 + i*8.9e-5$ $0 + i*5.5e5$	-0.011
Case 1b Flexible Fixture, Con. Pt.	$0 + i*1.36e-4$ $8951 - i*2450$ $8951 + i*2450$	-1
Case 2 Flexible Fixture, MCFS	$0 + i*2.28e-4$ $13050 - i*4285$ $13050 + i*4285$	-0.086



Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

21

21

Added Mass Method (Allen & Mayes)

- Negative mass can be eliminated by adding mass to the structure until the total mass is positive.
 - Suppose point masses are added at any of the points where the system's modes were measured. This changes the EOM by adding mass at each point (or each mode if using modal coord.):

$$\mathbf{M}_B + \Delta \mathbf{m}$$

- The smallest change to the mass matrix that will make all of its eigenvalues positive is:

$$\Delta \lambda_k = \begin{cases} 0 & \lambda_k > 0 \\ -\lambda_k + \varepsilon & \lambda_k \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

$$\mathbf{M}_B \boldsymbol{\psi}_k = \lambda_k \boldsymbol{\psi}_k$$

These are
eigenvectors /
eigenvalues of
the mass matrix,
not modes of B.

- where ε is a small value. This can be obtained using:

$$\Delta \mathbf{m} = \boldsymbol{\psi} \hat{\Lambda} \boldsymbol{\psi}^T$$

$$\boldsymbol{\psi} = [\boldsymbol{\psi}_k \quad \cdots \quad \boldsymbol{\psi}_{N_C}]$$

$$\hat{\Lambda} = \text{diag}[(\lambda_1 + \Delta \lambda_1) \quad \cdots \quad (\lambda_{N_C} + \Delta \lambda_{N_C})]$$

Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

22

22

Modal Scale Factor Method (Allen & Mayes)

- Negative mass implies that too much mass is being subtracted ! the scale factors of the transmission simulator modes may be in error.

□ Solution: Adjust the modal scale factors to produce a positive-definite mass matrix. But how?

- Eigenvalues of Mass Matrix of B (structure of interest)

$$\mathbf{M}_B \boldsymbol{\psi}_k = \lambda_k \boldsymbol{\psi}_k \quad \lambda_k < 0 \quad k = 0 \dots N_{\text{neg}}$$

- There are typically only a few negative eigenvalues and several modal scale factors (mm_j) that could be modified ! under-constrained optimization problem.

$$\mathbf{f}(\text{mm}_j) = [\lambda_k \quad \dots \quad \lambda_{N_{\text{neg}}}]^T$$


$$\mathbf{f}(\text{mm}_j + \Delta \text{mm}_j) = \mathbf{f}(\text{mm}_j) + [\nabla \mathbf{f}(\text{mm}_j)]_{\text{mm}_j} \Delta \text{mm}_j$$

Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

23

23

Application Examples



- Modal test obtains all modes below 20kHz for C and below 24kHz for A, 7 modes for TS and 15 modes for C
- The mass matrix of the resulting model for B has two negative eigenvalues:
 - $\lambda_1 = -0.00050468$
 - $\lambda_2 = -2.4058 \times 10^{-16}$, (essentially zero).
 - We desire to make these eigenvalues positive using the proposed methods.


Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

24

24

Results: Added Mass Method


- Using $\varepsilon=2.2\text{e-}14$ (100 times larger than machine precision), smallest eigenvalue becomes $2.2\text{e-}14$ as expected.
- How much mass had to be added to achieve this?
 - Ratio of the norm of \mathbf{M}_B to $\Delta\mathbf{m} = 0.000505$ (less than 0.05%!)



Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

25


Axial FRFs: Both Methods



Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

26

Three-Dimensional Plate-Beam System



- Test performed to measure the modes of C
- Analytical system D modeled with finite elements with a second copy of the transmission simulator
- C & D are joined and then two copies of the transmission simulator are removed (using the FEA model of the TS)


Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

27

27

Correct Mass Matrix after Assembling Full System, C+D-2A


- 4 Negative Eig.: $\lambda_1 = -0.197$, $\lambda_2 = -0.0764$, $\lambda_3 = -0.134$, $\lambda_4 = -0.118$
- Used added mass method, which revealed that 19.7% more mass had to be added to make the mass matrix positive definite.
- No deterioration observed in the quality of the FRFs



28

28

Correct Mass Matrix after Assembling Full System, C+D-2A



29

29

Conclusions

- The Transmission Simulator Method gives us the opportunity to expand our definition of an interface:
 - Traditional methods joined structures at a point or points
 - With the TSM we use the modes of a component to define the interface motion
- In applications to date, this greatly improves the robustness of experimental substructuring.
- Makes it possible to uncouple or couple two structures that are joined via a continuous interface.

Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

30

30


Additional Comments by R.L. Mayes

- Summary: Advantages of Transmission Simulator Method
 - Mass load the interface – improves the modal basis
 - Captures the joints between the substructures (stiffness and damping)
 - Allows continuous interfaces to be used
 - Using more accelerometers than modes of the fixture allows averaging out of experimental errors.
 - Drive points are more convenient to measure.

Additional Slides

Results: Modal Scale Factor Method

- Jacobian (or metrics) reveal that the negative eigenvalues are most strongly affected by modes 1 and 6.
- Using $\varepsilon=0.9999$, after 3 iterations the algorithm converges on:
 - $M_{ts,1}=0.99824$ and $M_{ts,6}=0.9999$
 - (or increase mode scale factors by: 1.0008798 and 1.000050)
- Works perfectly, however, what if we chose $\varepsilon=0.99$?



Short Course on Experimental Dynamic Substructuring, © 2020

33